

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawing figures include changes to Fig. 3. These sheets, which includes Fig. 1-4, replaces the original sheets including Fig. 3. In Figure 3, Applicant has properly labeled every block as suggested in the Office Action.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful review of this application. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action and the reference cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the above amendments, patently distinguish the claims over cited arts of record.

Claims 1 and 5 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1-8 remain pending.

Present Status of Application

All claims 1-8 are rejected. Specifically, claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. (EP0679983). Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada in view of Gorzelski et al. (US6134192).

Discussion of Office Action

Rejection of claims 1-8 based on 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al. (EP0679983). Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada in view of Gorzelski et al. (US6134192). As will be fully described in the following, the cited reference does not anticipate the claimed invention. The rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent claim 1 discloses a module for reading data carriers containing addressable coded data. The module has a processor arrangement and a reading unit. The processor arrangement further comprises a decoding function. The module receives a request, characterized by an identifier, for decoding data stored in coded form on the data carrier, controls the reading unit to read the data, converts the coded data into decoded data by the decoding function, and sends the decoded data, characterized by the identifier, to a data processing device. The identifier is used to distinguish between data belonging to the previous request and data belonging to the current request.

Therefore, the module uses the identifier to characterize the request command and sends the decoded data characterized by the identifier, so that sent data can be unequivocally identified.

However, Sawada did not disclose every feature of the claimed invention. For example, Sawada did not disclose that “the request is characterized by an identifier and the decoded data, characterized by the identifier, is sent to the data processing device.” Applicant disagrees with the examiner that “an interface circuit 9 that includes a control register, command register, status register, error register, and data register used to control the flow of data between the host and the drive 50 which reads on “receiving a request, characterized by an identifier, for decoded data which are stored in coded form on the data carrier” claimed. Actually in col. 8, line 54 to col. 9 line 22 and FIG. 2 of Sawada, Sawada describes: “Interface circuit 9 is used to control the flow of data between the host and drive 50 and includes a control register, command register, status register, error register and data register. Of these, the status register includes a field for retaining the current operation mode of drive 50 (operation modes of drive 50 will be described in section C) and a Busy Flag for presenting an activity of drive 50 to the host.....The host OS can recognize the status of drive 50 by polling this status register. Interface and decoding circuits are shown in FIG. 2 with identical reference numeral 9, and may be configured with the same chip or separate chips..... Host control signal 19 is a signal used by the host to communicate its intention to drive 50 and provided for two purposes in this embodiment.....Conversely, drive status signal 20 is a signal used by drive 50 to communicate its intention to the host, and consists of two signal lines SS1 and SS2, as described above.....” According to Sawada, the registers (including control register, command register, status register, error register and data register) are used to communicate the host and the drive 50. For example, if the host wants to know the status of the drive 50, the host OS just polls the status register which stores the status of the drive 50. In addition, the status register may contain active, idle, standby, sleep, and suspend information to represent the status of the drive. Therefore, the registers store information to be used by the host. But the registers of Sawada are **not**

used to characterize the request and the decoded data, which are used to distinguish between data belonging to the previous request and data belonging to the current request.

Therefore, the features of claim 1 are not disclosed by Sawada and claim 1 is patentable.

Regarding claim 2, Sawada discloses that the expansion device saves data required for a resume operation allowing a task to be restarted quickly and from precisely the same point of execution. The address of Sawada is stored in the RAM 15 and can be retrieved next time so that the task is restarted quickly and from the same address. However, the address is **not** used to characterize the decoded data. Hence claim 2 is not disclosed.

Regarding claim 5, according to col. 7 lines 21 to 23 in the specification, Sawada discloses: "CD-ROM drive (hereinafter also referred to as drive) 50 is connected to main CPU 70 through system bus 80 so that it can send to or receive commands from the host." So the host sends commands to the CDROM drive 50 by the system bus 80. And in col. 8, lines 11-13 in the specification, Sawada discloses: "When the signal is output as digital data to the host, decoder circuit 9 decodes the signal to send it to system bus 80." So the drive sends the decoded data to the host via the system bus 80. Obviously, the drive uses the **same** system bus to receive commands and send data. However, the claimed invention uses **two different** serial buses to receive command and send decoded data. Hence claim 5 is not disclosed.

Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits the claims 1-8 to overcome the rejections. In view of foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims and drawings are in proper condition for allowance. Examiner is invited to contact the attorney on record to expedite the prosecution in pursuance of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
WPAT, P.C.

By____/Justin I. King/_____
Justin I. King
Registration No. 50,464

October 1, 2008
WPAT, P.C.
1940 Duke Street
Suite 200
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 684-4411
Facsimile (703) 880-7487